

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated May 23, 2007.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claim 4 has been made dependent on claim 1.

Claims 6 and 7 have likewise been amended to depend from claim 1. Trivial amendments have been made to claims 6 and 7 to correct antecedence issues arising from their dependency on claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(a)

The Examiner argues that Katayama teaches a cartridge comprising “printhead maintenance means” by virtue of Katayama’s printhead being configured for ejection of ink which is not for recording operations. The Examiner further argues that Katayama teaches a cradle comprising “drive means for said printhead maintenance means” by virtue of Katayama’s controller providing ‘drive signals’ to a printhead.

In the Applicant’s submission, this interpretation of Katayama extends beyond what the skilled person reasonably understands the terms “printhead maintenance means” and “drive means” to mean. In particular, the skilled person would understand “printhead maintenance means” to embody a physical structure for maintaining the printhead. Such a structure may be, for example, a wiper, a pad, a suction cap *etc.* The skilled person would not interpret “printhead maintenance means” to include the printhead *per se*. Likewise, the skilled person would understand the “drive means” to be a mechanical device for driving the “printhead maintenance means”. In the Applicant’s submission, the Examiner’s interpretation of the Applicant’s claim language does not comply with the requirement for applying the broadest reasonable interpretation of language used in the claims.

Nevertheless, in deference to the Examiner’s rejection, claim 1 has been amended to make it explicitly clear that the “drive means” (as specified previously) is a motor. Claim 1 further specifies that the motor is mechanically coupled to the printhead maintenance means when the cartridge and the cradle are mated together. Basis for this amendment can be found at, for example, page 10, lines 25-26 of the description.

With this amendment to claim 1, there can no longer be any ambiguity as to the scope of claim 1. Furthermore, neither Silverbrook nor Katayama teach a motor in a cradle which is for driving a printhead maintenance means of a replaceable printer cartridge. Such an arrangement is not suggested anywhere in either of these documents. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to reconsider the rejection of obviousness.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762